

# The Republican.

---

No. 12, Vol. 9.] LONDON, Friday, March 19, 1824. [PRICE 6d.

---

TO THE REVEREND ROBERT HINDMARSH,  
PRIEST OF THE SECT OF SWEDENBORGIAN,  
OFFICIATING AT THE NEW JERUSALEM  
TEMPLE, SALFORD, MANCHESTER.

*Continued from page 350.*

I proceed to the seventh section.

## CARLILE'S CONTEMPT OF MANKIND, AND ADMIRATION OF BRUTES.

VII. But he continues: "Swedenborg himself, and those who follow him, are not only unnatural grovellers, but they are *beastalized men*, not worthy to rank even with the mass of mankind, depraved, ignorant, and contemptible as they are. They are a sect, that has not the least claim to rationality, and no one of them can be a rational being!" As members of the New Church, we do not pretend to rank above our fellow-men, for each of us can say with the Latin poet, "*Homo sum, humani nihil à me alienum puto*;" or in other words, "Whatever be the infirmities of human nature, or however degenerate the great mass of mankind may be, considered in themselves, we have no desire to be thought superior to others in those faculties of the mind, which are common to all intelligent beings." Yet, being created in the image and likeness of God, and conscious that we are destined to a state of immortality in another life, we do not, like Materialists and Atheists, place ourselves on a level with the beasts that perish; neither do we boast of belonging to the family of monkeys, apes, and baboons. We do not, with Mr. Carlile in his *Republican* for May 30, 1823, acknowledge ourselves to be "*beasts of prey*:" still less do we believe with him, that brute animals possess the same capabilities of speech and reason as a man. He may indeed, if he please, indulge himself in the luxury of fraternizing with bears and tigers, hogs and dogs, cats and rats, jackdaws and owls: he may, in his fantasy, either raise them to his own standard, or basely prostrate himself below the dignity of his nature, and "say to corruption, Thou art my *father*; to the worm, Thou art my *mother*, and my *sister*," Job. xvii. 14. Or "I am a *brother to dragons*, and a *companion to owls*," Job xxx. 29. In short, he may, if in reality he thinks that he is born to no higher destiny than that of a brute beast, assume the attitude of one, by crawling on the earth, with his countenance fixed in the dust; or, conscious of possessing a little more knowledge and cunning, than the rest of his associates, he may take upon himself the character either of a dancing

---

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 84, Fleet Street.

*Bear*, or of a **LEARNED PIG**, or of a well instructed *Goose*. (\*) But what will be said of him by those of the rational species, who are still desirous of remaining in the order of their creation, from whose ranks he has traitorously deserted, to join the standard of four, six, ten, and a hundred-footed reptiles? What, but that he is a fool for his pains, and that in the end "he shall be buried with the burial of an ASS!" Jer. xxii. 19.

In using the words, *beastalized men*, I wish to explain, that I impute no *unnatural vice*; nor do I see that you have so taken it. I define the expression to be a perversion of that power of discrimination which distinguishes man from beast; that you may as well be without the faculty of speech and reason as to make so bad a use of it; that, by using it as you do, you degrade yourselves to a degree beneath what we call the irrational animals; because all such animals are perfectly rational in seeking their individual happiness; whilst you destroy that capacity in yourselves, by torturing your minds with chimeras, and notions impossible to be realized.

As to the expression, *beasts of prey*, on which you carp, you should have given the context, to be honest. That context was, that every animal, fed by animal food, was a beast of prey. Nothing can be more clear. The words, *beast of prey*, have no other definition or distinction, than an animal that feeds upon animal food. The difference in glutting ourselves with it whilst life is in the body, and in employing others to kill and cook it, is a difference in mode only, and not in fact and substance. Let the person, who dislikes the epithet, *beast of prey*, renounce it by abstaining from animal food: there is no other evasion of the character.

As to the fraternity of animals, I know that I am one, and that you are nothing more. I did not make myself. I do not complain. I see nothing, no person, superior to myself, in a general sense; therefore, I feel no degradation, no humiliated condition: I acknowledge no master; I submit to no driver; I am as independent as the planet that bears me, and feel, that, in relation to the universe, I am of just as much consequence as that planet. As an individual being, **I AM THE CENTRE, AND THE UNIVERSE IS MY CIRCUMFERENCE.** There, Sir, I defy you, with all your spiritual no-

(\*) That *Bears* and *Pigs*, as well as other animals, are capable of being taught a variety of pranks, and even to make a shew of something resembling the rational faculty, yet still within the limits of their instinctive sagacity, is well known: and of the late Sir Ashton Lever it is said, that he instructed a *Goose* to wait upon him at table, and at the word of command to bring him a napkin under her wing.

tions, to grovel or to soar higher than that. I care not how or where I am buried, so that I am not buried alive. I do not know how the Jews buried their asses, for Jehovah has not revealed that important matter; but, I believe, we make the best possible use of them in this country, by turning the skin into leather, the flesh into food, and the bones into knife handles, toys, &c. I never saw a dead ass, never heard of the death of one, to my recollection, and believe, they possess some of the same materials as Methuselah must have worn. For aught I know to the contrary, that talkative and obstinate Ass of Balaam's may be living somewhere. If Swedenborg could go into the spiritual world when alive in the body, it is very strange that he cannot come back to us now he is a spirit: he may be able to explain how asses are used in heaven, and whether King Jehovah's sons ride about upon white ones, as some of the Jewish princes were wont to do. There is a curious story in the New Testament about an Ass stealer; do you know it? Bear with it!—Nothing can be more ignorantly insolent, nor more insolently ignorant than the section under examination; it is purely Christian!—Proof spirit! I would have passed it unnoticed, had I not considered the probability, that the Reverend Writer of such language, would chuckle at the proof of having wounded me by so foul an attack, with such foul matter. Were I a Priest, I would certainly study to do all I could, to make that foul and suspected office respectable in the eyes of the greatest possible number.

I was advised, that Mr. Hindmarsh was incapable of writing many sentences, even sections, to be found in this pamphlet; but now, my informants think with me, that Mr. H. felt his weakness when fairly opposed, and resorted to what he would not have resorted to, had he to contend with nothing more powerful, than a member of some other Christian sect.

I proceed to the eighth section.

#### ONE TRUE REMARK FOUND IN CARLILE'S LETTER.

VIII. To do him justice, however, there is one true remark, which Mr. Carlile makes on the character of Swedenborg, not indeed with the design of complimenting him on his piety, or the soundness of his judgment, but of exposing the weakness of his understanding; and that is the following: "He never for a moment suffered himself to mistrust the more than human pretensions of the Bible. He took every thing for granted, that he found in it." As much as to say, 'He sincerely believed the scriptures of divine truth, and cordially embraced them.' Well would it have been for Mr. Carlile, had he cherished the same humility of mind and veneration for revealed truth, which distinguished the great man, whom he so wantonly

reviles. He might still have exercised his powers of reason, and made that faculty, which if properly used, places him high above the brute creation, subservient to the attainment of just conceptions concerning the Supreme Being, the Holy Word, and his own immortality. But suffering himself to be guided in his judgment solely by the senses, and ignorantly supposing that nothing can have a real existence, but what he can see with his eye, hear with his ear, taste with his tongue, smell with his nose, or feel with his hands, he hastily concludes, that there is no such thing as an immaterial soul or spirit; that thoughts and affections are so many exhalations, vapours, and gases, issuing from outward objects, and playing within him under the name of sensations; that heaven and hell are mere phantasies, invented by priests to cajole or frighten mankind; that divine revelation is all a farce; that life itself is nothing else but matter in motion; and by necessary consequence, that there is no Supreme Being, intelligent, wise and good, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent, much less holy, just, and provident in all his ways; in short, that there is no God in the universe, but Nature alone!!!

That is not amiss: thank you: I never blush at being called ignorant by men who confess they can teach me nothing: nor by those who can; for I feel satisfied within myself, that I pursue knowledge with the simplicity of a child joined to the ardour of a man.

I proceed to your ninth section.

#### CARLILE'S ASSERTION, THAT THERE IS NO DESIGN IN THE HUMAN FORM.

IX. In p. 622, Mr. Carlile says, that an infant at the birth "has eyes, ears, and nasal organs; but, so far from these being designed for any purpose, it is evident, that it is only from the necessitating influence of surrounding circumstances, that they are brought into use." And again, "The new-born infant is a blank *designed for nothing*, but capable of being cultivated. There is *no design* in the matter, beyond that which proceeds from the respective parents. If there was *design*, may we not justly upbraid it" (what? he must mean the Supreme Power) "for having caused so much misery?"

I have, in the course of my time, read to the amount of some thousands of volumes, written by many different authors and on many different subjects. But, to the best of my recollection, I never met with such broad, bare-faced, insane blasphemy in any one of them, as is to be found in some of Mr. Carlile's productions. The above is only a faint specimen of what the man is capable of. Yet how much does it display of the state of his mind! And how plainly does it announce the kind of association, into which his spirit has entered! David well observed in his day, concerning those who only *contemplated* such wickedness, or only *wished* there might be no Invisible Power to bring them to a future judgment, "The fool hath said in his heart *There is no God!*" Psalm. xiv. 1. But this *modern fool* hath not only said the same in his heart, in his silent meditations on the subject, and in the secret thoughts of his understanding; but he has more than once or twice made an open avowal of his infidelity; he has in direct terms challenged the great Jehovah himself as a false God, the mere idol of the Jews, and an imaginary Being, whom Christians also have raised to the supreme power over heaven and earth! He shamelessly asserts, that there is *no design, no end in view*, in the formation of man, or in the

organization of the human frame! The eyes, ears, hands, and other parts of the body with all their astonishing powers, are with him the mere results of chance, of surrounding circumstances, and not the work of an all-wise, all-provident, all-powerful Being! Because he is so blind, as not to see his God, so deaf as not to hear his voice; so dull of apprehension, as not to discern his hand in the wonderful works of creation, he boldly presumes first to rob him of his glory, by denying that he had any designs of benevolence; and then to reproach him for his cruelty, in causing so much wretchedness and misery to mankind! But indeed the general tenour of all his writings is to deny the very existence of a Supreme Being, and to ascribe every thing in the universe to mere chance, circumstance, and dead matter.

To suppose, that a new-born infant is a mere blank, designed for *nothing*; that his eyes, ears, nostrils, tongue, hands, and feet, were not formed with a view to any future use or exercise, but were produced by an accidental concourse of lifeless atoms, and yet so wonderfully adapted, by their peculiar organization, to the various objects around them, must surely be the height of ignorance, or downright insanity. How plainly is it to be seen, that the eye, with its various coats and humours, is formed for the perception of light and colours; the ear, with its membranes, hammer, stirrup, anvil, cylinders, and cochlea, for hearing sounds; the nostrils, with their olfactory nerves for smelling odours; the tongue, with its papillæ, for tasting, and also for speech; the hand, one of the most astonishing instruments that could be contrived, for every kind of ingenious and useful work; and the feet for the purpose of locomotion, whereby an active intercourse is maintained between man and man, and the general interests of society are promoted! Yet Mr. Carlile, who sets himself up as a reformer, and teacher of moral and political wisdom, can discover no traces of design in the structure of the human body, which by every person of sound understanding is allowed to be one of the most evident proofs of Divine Agency, that can possibly be required or given. But as it would be a fruitless labour to reason with a blind man about the just arrangement of light, and shade, and colours, in a beautiful landscape, or with a deaf man about the harmony of sounds in a piece of delightful music; so it would be equally useless to appeal to the judgment of a confirmed Atheist or Materialist, for an acknowledgment either of wisdom, design, or benevolence, in any one of the productions of omnipotence. He cannot see, in a personal form, any Being worthy of the name of Creator and Governor of the universe, riding upon the clouds, or walking upon the earth; and being blind to the glories, and deaf to the harmonies, that constantly surround the Divine Presence in all his works, he boldly denies the existence of any other God than Nature, or of any other Supreme Power than that of Matter in a state of perpetual motion, change, and revolution!

Here is much more of rhetoric, than of argument or answer, to the part of my letter on which the section is founded. Whatever you might have read, you do not seem to have learnt enough to overthrow the sketch that I drew of the human character, the human body rather, in my first letter. Call it not *insane blasphemy*—refute it. You acknowledge, that I use no ambiguity—then answer my plain statement. I wish nothing about *future judgment*: knowing it would be futile so to wish. I do not fear it. I am open to any and to

every judgment; judge who may. Yes, in direct terms, I do challenge the great Jehovah himself as a false God—no! not as a false God; for I know no true Gods. I do say, that he was nothing more than the Idol of the Jews, as Jupiter was the chief Idol of other people. I do shamelessly assert, that there is no design, no end in view, in the formation of man, or in the organization of the human frame—and further—I write this of a Sunday night, or of a Monday morning rather, at two o'clock. I recollect the time when I was afraid to touch a pack of cards before the clock had struck twelve on a Sunday night: BUT NOW!—HAPPY AM I! I FEAR NOTHING; BUT TO DO WRONG, TO INJURE MY FELLOW ANIMAL! The dreadful, useless fears, which superstition generates, destroy the healths and distract the minds of mankind. Fits, faintings, cold sweats, horror, terror, are the perpetual concomitants of a superstitious mind—these I have surmounted, and desire to raise all mankind above them. You call the devil my friend and instructor: I smile, and say, I neither know nor fear any such being. Having conquered my fears of him; I feel, that I have conquered all that exists of such a being. I can neither make one omnipotent idol the parent of all evil; nor another the parent of all good and evil. I will neither hate the one, nor worship the other. I feel that I am mentally free and independent of both; by having discovered that Jewish and Christian Priests have done nothing more than the African Negroes have done and now do—make a great ugly figure—call it the devil—frighten themselves with the work of their own hands—and then run away from it! Thanks to Thomas Paine and others, I have ceased “to dream of the devil and wake in a fright.” Convinced that there is no supernatural power; convinced that personified spirits never did, never can exist; I will undertake to dispel all fears of apparitions or haunted houses that may now exist, if I could but remove to the places where such fears are to be found.

The arguments with which I meet your notions of supernatural design are these. Every animal applies every faculty to the purpose for which it is applicable: this from a matter of necessity. For instance, a young bird, when full fledged, is pushed from its nest, to provide for itself, by the sagacity of its parent. It is evidently full of terror at the thought of being pushed from its footing on the nest: it has no ideas of the use of its wings, until it begins to fall, then the wings expand from fear, and their powers are found. An infant is taught the use of its feet, after the same manner,

and by gradually feeling and acquiring a knowledge of their powers and purposes. Its hands are brought into use precisely upon the same principle; or why does it not grasp the spoon or coral at a month or two months old? Experience is the only design that brings them into action.

You have reasoned *reasonably* in the middle of the last paragraph, in this section; losing sight of the soul for a moment, you have scientifically described the properties of the eyes, ears, nose, and tongue. You have made up the man without the soul! Now say, can the soul act the real man without these bodily properties? Or say, what need of a soul has a man, in addition to the natural properties you have so well described as his possession? You acknowledge, that the soul of a blind man cannot judge of colours; nor that of a deaf man of music: must not such be imperfect souls? A confirmed Atheist or Materialist is one, who does not pretend to know, that which he does not know. Upon your own confession, he is a more honest man than his opponent. He desires neither to delude, nor to be deluded.

I proceed to your tenth section.

#### CARLILE'S DENIAL OF AN IMMORTAL IDENTITY.

X. On the subject of immortality Mr. Carlile thus expresses himself, p. 620: "All identity is temporary and mortal. *There is no immortal identity*" Which is as much as to say, 'There is no one being or thing now in existence, or ever will be, whether conscious or unconscious of life, that shall remain to eternity identically the same. He or it shall, in process of time, be completely changed as to its constituent parts. The constant motion and action of one species of matter upon another, which is perceived now, must have existed from all eternity: and during that time every object in nature must have been changed, dissolved, and renewed, over and over again. Not one of these objects, therefore, can be identically the same now, as it was once: neither shall it hereafter be precisely, or in all respects, what it now is, that is, no longer the same. Even if there be such a thing or being as a God, he also shall submit to the same change or succession of particles that compose his substance. The God, that existed a hundred or a hundred thousand years ago, cannot be identically the same God, as he who is so called in the present day: neither shall the one, who now flourishes in the imagination of Jews and Christians, carry his identity into the future ages of endless duration. For, as before observed, all identity is *temporary and mortal*; there is *no immortal identity*.'

Such is the reasoning adopted by the Materialist and Atheist on the subject of immortality: and as he knows, that if he were to admit the possibility of an immortal identity even in the Deity himself, who is called a Spirit, it might be extended to human souls or spirits, the recipient forms of love and wisdom, that is, of life from him, therefore, in order to maintain some appearance of consistency in the hypothesis he has adopted, he still argues as if love, wisdom, and life, were somewhat natural, and subject to the same changes and vicissitudes, as particles of matter driven about in endless revolution. With him, God, angels, and

spirits, are mere bugbears, creatures of a diseased imagination, generated in the bed of ignorance, and cherished by the fears of mankind, who almost with one consent have suffered their understandings to be imposed upon by the ambitious views of artful and designing priests. But let us inquire a little more narrowly into the true nature of identity, natural, spiritual, and divine; and we shall have abundant reason to conclude, notwithstanding the fallacious reasonings and confident assertions of the mere groveller in nature, that man is born to a nobler inheritance, than the enjoyment of a few fleeting years in this perishable life; that in the midst of all the changes and successions of matter, to which his bodily frame is subject, he still carries about him a principle of conscious identity; and that, as an immortal spirit, he will for ever retain such identity, if a virtuous character, in the regions of happiness and peace, but if of a contrary disposition, in the unspeakable miseries which are entailed on vice.

This is the hard point I alluded to, as the exception in your pamphlet, of the extracts from my letter. "All identity is temporary and mortal. *There is no immortal identity.*" That is a truth. You confess it, in your effort to shake it. The eleventh section is the subject continued, so I proceed to copy it.

#### THE NATURE OF IDENTITY CONSIDERED.

XI. IDENTITY may be predicated of three distinct orders of being, natural, spiritual, and divine. The first order includes the three kingdoms of nature, the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal: the second order embraces whatever is intellectual, rational, and spiritual, belonging to man, as distinguished from the inferior creation: and the third is to be referred exclusively to the Supreme being, who, being love, wisdom, and life, in their origin and utmost perfection, cannot possibly be subject to any variability or shadow of change. On the identity peculiar to each of these orders of being, let the following brief observations be carefully attended to.

I. The identity belonging to nature in its three kingdoms is admitted to be temporary, and not permanent. For though the identity of the whole earth or terraqueous globe, with its surrounding atmosphere, or of the moon, or of any other of the planetary bodies, taken in a general point of view, may be presumed to remain, and to be now what it was a thousand years ago, still, the particular parts of this globe, especially the objects on and near its surface, being subject to continual changes, the question of identity seems to be raised in reference to these latter, rather than to the whole body of our planet. Exhalations from the minerals and fossils in the bowels of the earth, and from every part of its surface, are continually ascending into the atmosphere; and again, after numerous changes, are returned back in other forms. Many, if not all, of the substances, from which these exhalations arise, though they long retain their apparent identity, are yet so completely transmuted in the course of ages, that they are no longer what they once were; and of these it may be truly said, they have lost their identity, not as it respects the particles themselves, which have passed off into the atmosphere, for these still exist somewhere, but as it respects the same mass or congregation of particles under one particular form. A river retains its nominal identity, though the water, of which it consists, is continually gliding away, and succeeded by a new stream. Water, heated in a vessel, will soon rise by

evaporation, mingle with the airiform fluids of the atmosphere, and altogether lose its identity as a vessel of water. It is the same with any substance that is consumed by fire, such as wood, coals, &c. The identity, which in these cases belonged to the object in its former condition, is now evidently destroyed: and therefore it is plain, that identity in relation to inanimate, unorganized bodies is temporary, and not permanent.

That there is an identity belonging to the various subjects of the vegetable kingdom, though still of a fleeting and perishable nature, is also too plain to be denied. A plant, a tree, a forest, has each its identity, which it retains for a longer or a shorter period, according to circumstances. The sturdy full-grown oak, which has withstood the blast for more than a hundred years, is still the same tree, that shot forth from the acorn a tender sapling. Though it may have changed its original substances, while it was in the constant act of increasing its bulk by the acquisition of fresh matter, nevertheless, a kind of identity, rather apparent than real, still remains: for as the old substances passed off, new ones took their place and arranged themselves in the exact form and order of those which preceded: and it is this peculiarity, common to the whole vegetable kingdom, and to the animal kingdom also, that in a great degree fixes upon each subject the character of nominal identity during the whole period of its natural existence.

Again, identity in the subjects of the animal kingdom may be regarded in the same point of view, as it is in those of the two former great divisions of nature. Beasts, birds, insects, and fishes, have all their several identities: and even man, so far as he is the subject of mere animal life, or an aggregate mass of terrestrial substances, sustains a similar kind of identity with them, which is allowed to be mortal, and of comparatively short duration. But as, in addition to his animal nature, he is also possessed of faculties and powers infinitely superior to those of the brute creation; and as by virtue of them his identity rises into a more exalted order of life, and partakes of the character and privileges of immortality, the cause and ground of such high distinction shall be particularly stated in the succeeding article.

II. The soul or spirit of a man, agreeably to what has been already observed, is a form receptive of love and wisdom, or good and truth, from the Deity, which, considered in themselves, have nothing in common with matter, but are altogether exempt from, and superior to, those laws and relations, which govern and are peculiar to all the substances of nature. Love and wisdom are in their essence invariably *the same*: what is good and true to-day, must have been such in *all preceding ages*, and will continue the same *for ever*. No change of state, which is affection, no variation of form, which is thought, belonging to the recipient subject, that is, to the human mind, can alter the nature of divine love and wisdom, or divine good and truth, in themselves. It may indeed *appear* as if these latter suffered a change, because the life proceeding from the Deity enters into and actuates the recipient subject, according to its form and quality: still, however, it is but an *appearance*, since every thing good and true must necessarily partake of the immutability of its origin. As now the life proceeding from the Deity, which consists in the activities of love and wisdom, is uncreated, and therefore eternal, so the spiritual substances, which constitute the human mind, and which were created for the reception of that life, are by virtue of its immediate presence also rendered eternal and immortal. Hence the perception and consciousness of life, which are communicated to the soul or spirit of a man, constitute in him an imperishable identity.

In proof that man is possessed of such an imperishable identity, so far as the short period of his existence in this natural world will avail, let him only revert to the scenes of his infancy and youth, and he will find, that, however advanced he may be in years, or how often soever the material substances of his body may have been changed, according to the doctrine now generally received, he still retains in his memory or recollection a clear and distinct view of occurrences long since gone by. Now this memory of past events, which is no other than a permanent retention of the various changes of state, and variations of form, which were once induced on his mind, evidently demonstrates the identity of his soul or spirit, an identity far surpassing any thing of the kind observable in the substances of his bodily frame. From these and other circumstances, which might be brought to elucidate the subject, it follows, that man, as an intellectual, rational, and spiritual being, is invested with mental powers and prerogatives inaccessible to the changes of matter, or the revolutions of time; and consequently that he has a right to expect, and is qualified to enjoy, the gift of immortality and eternal life.

III. With respect to the identity of the Divine Being, the great Fountain of all life, as this has already been noticed in some of the preceding observations concerning the identity of a man and other subjects of creation, little more need be said, except that he is identically and infinitely the same from eternity to eternity; that he is the same in every place, the same with every one and in every one; and that all variableness and changeableness are in the creature, which is formed for the reception of life from him. His identity must, therefore, in every respect be infinite and eternal.

The Atheistical Materialist, however, whose eyes are closed against the introduction of sound reason, as well as revelation, presumes, in the pride of his little heart, and in the darkness of his perverse understanding, to declare, that "*there is no Immortal Identity*;" in other words, that there is no God in existence! This detestable position being converted by him into a kind of maxim, he proceeds to express the delight he feels in the contemplation of his own approaching extinction, and the annihilation of one generation of mankind after another! "A correct knowledge (says he) of this is *the most happy state of mind*, that a man can enjoy; because he is then free from all cares about *the future*, and is in a proper state to improve himself for the benefit of *the present*. The improvement of his condition in *this life* becomes his *only aim*, as it is his *only duty*."

Were it possible for a brute to know and reflect on the shortness of his life, and the certainty of its dissipation at the period of death, and were he at the same time possessed of the powers of speech, what other sentiments could he be supposed to express, than those which Mr. Carlile has here adopted for himself? Would he not, regardless of the future, and careful only for present enjoyment, address himself to his fellow-brute, and say, "Hail, brother and companion in the pleasures of sensuality! Let us eat, drink, and be merry; for to-morrow we die!"

I will leave this subject precisely where you have left it, after saying—that a dead man has no memory; therefore, the memory, whilst alive, does not constitute immortal identity. You cannot prove immortal identity without proving a personified soul separate from the body, and a personified intellectual God—that you have not done, and there I leave

you in a bog. You have struggled hard to get into it; I will help you out, when you call me.

I proceed to your twelfth section.

#### METAMORPHOSIS OF WORMS INTO BUTTERFLIES, AN EMBLEM OF MAN'S RESURRECTION AND IMMORTALITY.

XII. It is to divine revelation, and not to the light of nature, that we are indebted for the knowledge and assurance of the immortality of the human soul. But the truth, being once made known, is capable of illustration and confirmation from various phenomena among the animated tribes. Certain worms, which creep on the ground, and feed on the leaves of plants, represent man's earthly and low state in this natural world: but presently, when the time of their change arrives, they become chrysalises, aurelias, nymphs, and at length butterflies; and when they have suffered this metamorphosis, to which they instinctively aspired, as to a higher and nobler state of existence, they are then clad with beautiful wings, and fly forth into the air, as into their heaven, where they indulge in festive sports, pair together, lay their eggs, and nourish themselves with a sweet and pleasant food extracted from flowers. Who does not see some image of man's earthly state in these animals, while they are worms, and an image of his heavenly state in the same animals, when they become butterflies? (\*)

Had you read some better matter, than the many thousand volumes of bad matter which you seem to have read, you would not have put forth this stale and thoroughly refuted comparison. To shew you that it was refuted near three years ago, I will copy from my "Observations on Dr. Gregory's Letters," the statement and refutation as they there stand. The Doctor having referred to the restoration of suffocated persons, proceeds thus:—

"Nearly allied to these are the examples of peculiar transformations undergone by various insects. and the state of rest and insensibility which precede those transformations; such as the chrysalis or aurelia state of butterflies, moths or silk-worms. The *Myrmeleon formicale* of whose larva and its extraordinary history Reaumur and Roesel have given accurate descriptions, continues in its insensible or chrysalis state about four weeks. The *Libellula*, or dragon-fly, continues still longer in its state of inaction. Naturalists tell us that the worm repairs to the margin of its pond in quest of a convenient place of abode during its insensible state. It attaches itself to a plant or a piece of dry wood; and the skin, which gradually becomes parched and brittle, at last splits opposite to the upper part of the thorax. Through this aperture the insect, now become winged, quickly pushes its way, and being thus extricated from confinement, begins to expand its wings, to flutter, and finally to launch into the air with that gracefulness and ease which are peculiar to this majestic tribe. Now who, that saw for the first time the little pendant coffin in which the animate insect lay entombed, and was ignorant of the transformations of which we are now speaking, would ever predict that in a few weeks, perhaps a few days or hours, it would become one of the most elegant and active of winged insects? And who, that contemplates with the mind of a philosopher that

(\*) See Emanuel Swedenborg's work on *Conjugal Love*, n. 418.

curious transformation, and who knows that two years before the insect mounts the air, even whilst it is living in water, it has the rudiments of wings, can deny that the body of a dead man may at some future period be again invested with vigour and activity, and soar to regions for which some latent organization may peculiarly fit it?"

To this I answer.

"I, Doctor, I can deny it. In no part of the transformations of butterflies, moths, or silk-worms, does any thing like natural death occur, and he who "*contemplates with the mind of a philosopher*" can perceive, that these transformations take place upon the same principle as a snake throws off its coat or skin, or as a bird moults and changes the feather once a year; although, in the latter instance, there is not an equal transformation. Anatomists have dissected the butterfly in its chrysalis or aurelia state, and they can trace the lineament of the future wings and form of the insect, in that state, which is sufficient to indicate that nothing like a new birth takes place, but merely a moulting or casting of the outer coat; which, from its texture, is not so easily shifted by the living insect, as is the coat of a snake, or the feather of a bird. There are many parallels in natural history of those transformations, and some of them more to be admired than that of the butterfly: there are instances where the insect or animal can restore an eye and a limb after it had been violently deprived of it, which, in my opinion, is a much more wonderful circumstance than the transformation of the butterfly from its aurelia to its winged state. Before the Doctor can say this is a parallel or authority for the resurrection of the human race, he must be prepared to say, that the insect, the vital part of the insect, is extinct in passing through the transformation.

"Even this idea the doctor has borrowed from Thomas Paine, who has brought forward stronger arguments in proof of a resurrection than all the priests put together; but it was Mr. Paine's hope rather than conviction, and the reason why I dissent from this part of his principles, is, that I seek for conviction in preference to indulging a hope, a vain and superstitious hope. On such subjects, Hope is the sister of Faith, and to harbour either in the mind, is subjecting it to prostitution, and like making it a brothel, wherein those frail sisters may pursue their vicious craft and career. The mind of man should seek conviction on all points, and where conviction cannot be had, neither Belief, nor Faith, nor Hope, should enter.

"This, then, is the refutation I give the Doctor upon this point, that the parallel between the state of man after death and that of the torpid chrysalis is not good, for they are not both dead alike. Man, when a fœtus, or in a state of embryo, or when emerging from the womb, would be a better parallel. There is another point of view in which this case might be looked at; let us expose the human body and the butterfly, in its aurelia state, to a

chemical test; let us expose them both to the action of fire, and we shall find no further transformation in the animal matter of the aurelia state of the butterfly than in the animal matter of man. There is another point required to make even the Doctor's argument, or rather Thomas Paine's argument of the least weight, and that is—Is the winged state of the butterfly less mortal than was the aurelia state? As a symbol of the transformation of man from mortality to immortality, the butterfly should have been immortal, and as it is not, the argument, or the authority, or the parallel, does not stand valid. The butterfly, whether in its larva, its aurelia, or its mature and winged state, is an organized animal, as much as man in his foetus, his infant, or his mature state; both are mortal alike; death is equally the annihilation of the animal form of both, or of their peculiar organization: they live, they procreate their species, they die alike, by the same rules, to the same purpose, as every other organized animal."

I proceed to your thirteenth section.

#### ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF MAN'S IMMORTALITY.

XIII. AN argument, drawn from the relative condition of man and other animals, may be fairly advanced in favour of that state of immortality, which the Scriptures of divine truth award to the human race, though denied by the Materialist, who, instead of walking like a man with his eyes directed to heaven, delights to go upon his belly, and to grovel in the dust. By native instinct beasts and birds seek for such objects as may gratify their appetites. The fact, that the instinct exists, is proof sufficient that there is somewhere in nature an object, to which it leads. So in the case of man, who enjoys the faculty of enlightened reason, as a still nobler gift than that of instinct, the fact, that he is in possession of it, and that by the exercise of it he is led to the contemplation of an end glorious in itself, and dear to his heart, namely, a state of immortality beyond the grave, is a similar and equally satisfactory proof, that he is destined by an all-wise and merciful God to the enjoyment of everlasting life in another and a better world.

Another and the last argument, which shall be adduced in favour of the immortality of the human soul, is the very unequal distribution of rewards and punishments, which is observed to take place in the present state of being. How often do acts of the greatest enormity, such as murders, thefts, adulteries, and the like, escape the visitations of justice in this life; when yet no reasonable man can deny, that they call for exemplary punishment! And, again, how often does it happen, that the most meritorious acts (humanly considered) of benevolence, fidelity, and integrity, go altogether unrewarded, except by the internal pleasure of performing them; while vice and guilt, clothed in the specious garb of virtue and honour, are seen to prosper and triumph! If there be an Omniscient Being, who superintends and marks the conduct of his intelligent creatures, and no one possessed of sound reason can deny it, surely this state of things cannot be final. The beasts that perish, having no law implanted within them to controul the natural tendency of their respective instincts, cannot be supposed to be amenable for their acts to any tribunal of justice: for, however gentle and mild, or however savage and fierce, may be their dispositions, they can never be brought to a due sense either of the merit or demerit of their actions.

But the case is widely different with man, who, being gifted with a power capable of restraining the inordinate lusts, by which he is infested, is therefore an accountable being, and must, by the laws of order, which bind society together, be held responsible either here or hereafter for every transaction of his life. The scale of justice, however, as before observed, is not always uplifted in this temporary state of existence: and hence it follows, that a more equal distribution of rewards and punishments will take place in another life; consequently that the soul or spirit of a man, which is the real agent in all his works, will survive the death of the body, the subject either of a wretched or of a blessed immortality.

The argument of this section is not valid. First, the power equal to constitute rewards and punishments in a future life, must be equal to constitute a just distribution in this life; and such a power in existence, and not dealing out this justice, must be an unjust power. The injustice of the first instance is the worst of all arguments, that it will be remedied in the second. We must have a better moral code than this, before we shall have a moral people. A delay of justice is injustice: and punishment is only just where it follows instantly upon the offence. The reason why crimes go unpunished, in the present state of society, is, that we have an inefficient legislature. An efficient legislature; a few such Jurists as the venerable Jeremy Bentham, would soon set this matter right; if they could but legislate accordingly.

The question of instinct is still more futile. Instinct in beasts, is like instinct in man; self-preservation, and self-gratification, are its motive principles. It is a thing of the passions. We act as we are organized or taught to act. If all the men who have lived had entertained this notion about immortality, the argument would not be conclusive, that desire constituted the possession. But the fact is, that a very small portion of mankind, but for a very short lapse of time, have been taught or entertained any notions of the kind. If desire be equivalent to possession, we should have a very powerful and universal instinct after that kind of wealth which feeds and gratifies the body, without labouring to produce it. No inferences of this kind will ever prove positive existences: we must have positive, visible, sensible proofs. Without these, it is of no value to us, whether we believe or not. What is not present, or to be present, cannot concern us.

I proceed to your three following sections, as they will require but a few words.

#### CARLILE'S VIEW OF SWEDENBORG'S WRITINGS.

XIV. Of the writings of Baron Swedenborg Mr. Carlile delivers his judgment in the following terms, p. 610: "Of all the Christian sects, whose

tenets have come under my view, those of Swedenborg are the most preposterous." That is to say, 'Of all the doctrines maintained by the professors of Christianity, those of the New Church are the most opposed to the system of Materialism and Atheism! the farthest removed from error, and the fallacious appearances of nature!' Why, Lucifer himself could not have paid a higher compliment to the good sense and discernment of her members. But it was unintentional on the part of Mr. Carlile, as well as of his ally: we therefore consider ourselves absolved from every obligation to either of them.

Again, in the same page, he says, "My conclusion of him (Swedenborg) is, that he first deceived himself with spiritual reveries, and then, finding that he could deceive others by the same means, he proceeded to add imposture to his own delusions." After quoting some highly important propositions from Mr. Clowes's pamphlet on the *Two Worlds, the Visible and the Invisible*, which lead to the most satisfactory conclusions, Mr. Carlile proceeds to give the heads of Emanuel Swedenborg's treatise on *Heaven and Hell*, with some extracts from the same, which cannot fail, in the estimation of every unprejudiced reader, to counteract the silly and absurd comments put upon them by a man; who professes and demonstrates his entire ignorance of spiritual things. Of these comments I have room to notice only one, and that is the following.

"Swedenborg (says he) has deprecated the doctrine of the Trinity, in so far as the Godhead is said to consist in three persons; but he has, in his arithmetic, committed still greater blunders, if possible, than the abused Trinitarians. He says, There is one heaven, and that the one heaven is like a man; that heaven is divided into two kingdoms; that this one heaven and two kingdoms are three heavens; that this one heaven, two kingdoms, and three heavens, consist of innumerable societies; and that every individual of every society is also a heaven!" After some other equally stupid remarks, Mr. Carlile adds, "You may tell me, that I do not understand spiritual things. *I confess my ignorance*; but I understand, that, when a writer is repeatedly contradicting himself, he is either a knave or a fool."

#### THE PRECEDING OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

XV. HERE Mr. Carlile attempts to hold up to ridicule the idea of one heaven (in a universal sense) consisting of two kingdoms, three heavens (in a less general sense), and innumerable societies, each individual of which is also a heaven in particular, or in its least form. But had he for a moment attended to the comparison, which is suggested by Swedenborg, of heaven being like one man, he must have seen, that, as the human form, though one, is still arranged according to an order that admits of general and particular divisions, all acting in perfect unanimity and harmony, so heaven in its universal form is in like manner arranged according to a similar order. Man, taken universally, or in the most general view of his frame, is under the dominion of two vital principles, that actuate every part of his body, namely, those of the heart and the lungs, both concurring by their peculiar functions to maintain the life of the whole. The same observation applies to the will and the understanding, which are formed for the reception of love and wisdom, that these two might exercise a joint authority over the whole mind. This universal arrangement may shew what is meant by the *two kingdoms*, into which the *one heaven* is divided. Again, according to another view of the human frame, nothing can be more evident, than that it is arranged into three general divisions, namely, the head, the trunk of the body, and the lower extremities, each subject to the

dominion of the heart and the lungs, and each concurring to form one man. And this arrangement clearly shews what the enlightened author further means, when he says, that heaven, though in a universal sense it is only one, is still, in a sense less general, to be regarded as consisting of *three heavens*. Lastly, as the human body, viewed with respect to its particular constituent parts, consists of innumerable members, organs, viscera, bones, cartilages, membranes, vessels, muscles, fibres, fibrillæ, &c. &c., and yet all conspire to one end, and each has an action or function, peculiar to itself; the same life, which animates the whole form, ruling in, and giving a distinct power of action to, every most minute part of the organization; so in like manner, but spiritually considered, the universal heaven consists of *innumerable societies* of blessed angels, each individual of whom participates in the life which is common to all, and each performs that particular function or ministry which is assigned to him, in such a manner as to promote and exalt the harmony, perfection, and happiness of the whole.

The same kind of arrangement is to be found in every living, organized subject, the work of a divine hand. It may be seen also, in its measure and degree, in the labours and contrivances of human ingenuity, as in a house, a time-piece and numerous other things; in a house, which, though one habitation, consists of a foundation, a superstructure, and a roof, with chambers of various descriptions; and in a time-piece, which, though one machine, consists of a spring or weights, wheels, and a dial plate to shew the hour. In each of these cases, and others which, might be mentioned in the way of illustration, that which is one in a general point of view, is yet, in a particular and subordinate sense, composed of many individual parts, which all conspire, by the harmony of their construction, to produce one result, one end, and one use. Where then is to be found the absurdity, or the contradiction, either in arithmetic or in common sense, which Mr. Carlile pretends to have detected, but in his own ignorant and thoughtless mind, which leads him to confound all distinctions, and to triumph in the shame of a perverted understanding?

With these observations I shall dismiss the present subject, not doubting but every intelligent reader, after witnessing the miserable attempts at argument, which have been in vain directed against the writings of Baron Swedenborg, and the doctrines contained in them, will be led to acknowledge, that the channels of truth are still pure and unpolluted, while the floods of infidelity, atheism, and ungodliness, are fast sinking into the opening earth. Rev. xii. 15, 16.

#### CARLILE NOT PROPERLY A DEIST, BUT AN INFIDEL, A MATERIALIST, AND AN ATHEIST.

XVI. It is usual to call those who deny the scriptures, and still believe in the existence of a Supreme Being called God, by the name of *Deists*. But the editor of the *Republican* cannot rank as one of that description, because he acknowledges no God but *Matter*, and no revelation but the *Book of Nature*. He is, therefore, truly, and properly speaking, an *Infidel*, a *Materialist*, and an *Atheist*. And these names are not given to him in the way of scorn and contempt, with a view to injure his character unfairly and unkindly; but they are titles and appellations of his own choice, the use and application of which are distinctly authorized by himself. *Deism* is with him a kind of milk-and-water system, not sufficiently characteristic of the sentiments he has adopted, or of the bold conclusions to which the pride and folly of self-derived or dust-originating intelligence have conducted him. Unlike the *Theophilanthropists* of France, who figured away for a time during the period of the Jacobinical Revolution, he can discover no

traits of wisdom or benevolence in the creation; but in the spirit and language of a discontented *Theomisanthropist*, that is, of one who "neither fears God, nor regards man," Luke xviii. 2, 4; or rather of one who *hates* them both, he upbraids the former, if (as he says) there be such a Being, with want of design and even cruelty in the formation of man; and the latter, among whom he is himself an unworthy individual, he reproaches as a "depraved, ignorant, and contemptible" race. As an unbeliever in the Bible, which he says is "neither true in history, nor in physics," he is an *Infidel*; as a supporter of the infinity and eternity of matter, he is a *Materialist*; and as a denier of all spirituality even in relation to a Supreme Being, he is nothing less than an avowed *Atheist*. On the absurdities attending Atheism and Materialism enough has been said in the preceding pages; a few observations, however, shall be made on the subject of *Infidelity*, or that part of *Deism*, which will not allow the Sacred Scriptures to be a divine revelation from heaven.

In the fourteenth section, yours is a mangled quotation of my statement of the heads of the absurdities of Swedenborg's doctrines. I refer you back to my letter, in No. 20, Vol. 8, to see whether my statement is not fully warranted by the heads of the chapters of the volume, entitled, "A treatise concerning heaven and hell," and the contents of that volume. All that is said by way of explanation, in the fifteenth section, is beside the question, and does not concern me. For an answer to the sixteenth section, I refer you to the general matter of this letter; but, in particular, to its commencement.

I come to the seventeenth section, on which I shall expatiate freely and largely.

#### LESLIE'S ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE HISTORY.

XVII. "I TELL you, (says Mr. Carlile, p. 625,) that the Bible is neither true in *history*, nor in *physics*; and I further tell you, that it is not even *moral*." Three distinct charges are here made; the first of which is, that the Bible history is false. On this point, I cannot do better, than quote the unanswerable arguments of a late respected clergyman, the Reverend Charles Leslie, M. A. in his *Short and Easy Method with Deists*. This author had been requested by a former Duke of Leeds to prove, in some concise and decisive way, the truth of the Bible, and of Christianity in particular. In the space of three days he produced a draught of the work above-mentioned, and presented it to the Duke, who, after perusing it with attention, said, "I thought I was a Christian before; but I am sure of it now; and as I am indebted to you for converting me, I shall henceforth look upon you as my spiritual father." A pious clergyman, the Rev. W. Jones, M. A. says of the same little work, that "the world affords nothing so effectual on the Christian evidences."

"The method I will take, (says Mr. Leslie,) is, first to lay down such rules, as to the truth of matters of fact in general, that where they all meet such matters of fact cannot be false. And then, secondly, to shew, that all those rules do meet in the matters of fact of Moses, and of Christ; and that they do not meet in the pretended facts of Mahomet, and the heathen

deities, nor can possibly meet in any imposture whatsoever. The rules are these: 1. That the fact be such, that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it. 2. That it be done publicly in the face of the world. 3. That there be public memorials of it, or monuments and actions kept up in memory of it. 4. That such monument, and such actions or observance, be instituted, and do commence from the time when the fact took place."

The two first rules, he observes, preclude all attempts at imposture; the fact being exposed to the investigation of the outward senses: and the two latter as effectually guard against any subsequent invention. For example; suppose any man should pretend, that yesterday he divided the Thames, in the presence of all the people of London, and carried the whole city, men, women, and children, over to Southwark, on dry land, the waters standing like walls on both sides; I say, (continues Mr. Leslie,) that it is morally impossible, that he could persuade the people of London, that this was true, when every man, woman, and child, could contradict him, and say, that this was a notorious falsehood, for that they had not seen the Thames so divided, nor had gone over on dry land. Therefore it is plain, that no such imposition could be put on men, at the time when such public fact was said to be done. The third and fourth rules equally secure against imposition in after-times; for there being no memorials or public observances instituted at the time of the pretended fact, nor regularly continued to a future age, any attempt to deceive the public must have been instantly detected.

Mr. Leslie then examines the Mosaic dispensation, and by these rules exhibits its reality and truth in the most conclusive, satisfactory manner. Could Moses have persuaded six hundred thousand men, that he had brought them out of Egypt, through the Red Sea, and fed them for forty years, without bread, by miraculous manna, if the facts recorded had not been true? No! because every man's senses, who was then alive, must have contradicted the assertion. Could the passage of the Israelites over Jordan, in memory of which twelve great stones were set up in Gilgal, be a fiction, when the whole nation were witnesses to the truth of the fact, and their children from generation to generation were reminded of the event? No! because an imposition of this kind could never have been played off upon a whole people, neither would they have handed it down to posterity in records of their most undoubted history. Could any man at this day invent a book of statutes, or acts of parliament, for England, and make it pass upon the nation as the only book of statutes that they had ever known? As impossible was it for the books of Moses (if they were invented in any age after Moses) to have been received for what they declare themselves to be, viz. the statutes and municipal law of the nation of the Jews. Was there ever a book of sham laws, which were not the laws of the nation, palmed upon any people, since the world began? If not, with what face can

Deists or Infidels say this of the laws of the Jews? Why will they say that of them, which they confess impossible in any nation, or among any people? But the books of Moses have a further demonstration of their truth, than other law-books have: for they not only contain the laws, but give an historical account of their institution, and the practice of them from that time; as of the passover in memory of the death of the first-born in Egypt; their passage through the Red Sea; the occurrences that befel them in the wilderness; their entrance into the land of Canaan; their sabbaths, daily sacrifices and yearly expiations; their new moons, festivals, and fasts; the institution of the priesthood in the tribe of Levi; and numerous ceremonies, some of yearly, some of monthly, some of weekly, and some of daily observance and recognition.

The same four rules or marks, which serve to prove that the great facts recorded in the historical books of Moses cannot be false, Mr. Leslie proceeds to observe, do likewise meet in the Gospel of our blessed Saviour. His works and his miracles are there said to be done publicly in the face of the world, as he argued to his accusers, "I spake *openly* to the world, and *in secret* have I said *nothing*," John xviii. 20. Here the two first of the rules above-mentioned evidently apply: and as for the two last, baptism and the holy supper were instituted as perpetual memorials of certain transactions, which formerly took place; and they were not instituted in after ages, but at the very time when the things were said to be done; and have been observed, without interruption in all ages, through the whole Christian world, down to the present day. And Christ himself did ordain apostles and other ministers of his gospel, to preach, administer the sacraments, and to govern his church, even unto the end of the world (or rather unto the consummation of the age or church), Matt. xxviii. 20. Accordingly they have continued by regular succession to this day.

Mr. Leslie then adds, "You may challenge all the Deists in the world to shew any action that is fabulous, which has all the four rules or marks before-mentioned. No, says he, it is impossible: and the histories of Exodus and the Gospel never could have been received, if they had not been true." Dr. Middleton, it appears, aware of the force of Mr. Leslie's arguments, and feeling how necessary it was to his principles, that he should some way or other rid himself of them, looked out for some false or pretended facts, to which those four marks might be applied; and this he did for twenty years together, without being able to find one. Mr. Leslie, however, does not say, that every thing, which wants those marks, is false; but that nothing can be false, which has them all. And this shews, that the matters of fact of Moses, and of Christ have come down to us better guarded, than any other matters of fact, how true soever. How unreasonable, then,

says he, is it to reject these facts so sifted, so examined, and so attested, as no other facts in the world ever were!

I will not dispute, that Leslie's four rules are the proper vouchers for historical truths; but I will dispute their application, either to the books of the Old or the New Testament. It is possible to write fables with more appearances of truth than the Bible affords. If Mr. Leslie had proved, or if you can prove, that such books, as the five first books of the Old Testament, were written by such a man as Moses is there described, and known to such a people as is there described emigrating from Egypt, then the two first rules will apply. And if Mr. Leslie has not proved, and if you cannot prove, that the twelve stones formed a monument in Gilgal, subsequent to the Babylonian captivity; that they were known there since the Jews have been known as a nation to other nations, and that they had been known, from time to time, by different respectable historians, back to the time of their alleged origin, nothing whatever can be proved by them. What do the stones of Stonehenge prove to us in the present day? Though they are now standing, as a monument of something in our own country, we know nothing more of the persons who put them there, or the time and cause of their being there put, than the Jews know, and all tales upon the subject are evidently fabulous inventions.

Had the Jew Books given some account of the building of the pyramids in Egypt, or of the existence of such pyramids, there would be some sanction for the story in the present existence of those monuments; but as to the stones in Gilgal, who knows any thing about them, or who has known them in time past? It is beyond question, that the pyramids in Egypt were erected before the time assigned to the Jewish emigration from that country; and yet, the only reference, in the Jew Books, to any thing left behind in Egypt, was the flesh pots, leeks, and onions! The two latter a sort of thing common to most countries; but known to have been, and to be, of a superior quality in Egypt.

These Gilgal-Jordan stones are not worthy of comparison with Stonehenge. We know no more how the latter stones were piled one upon another, than we know of the building of the pyramids of Egypt. But what you call a monument in Gilgal, of twelve great stones, must have been something as grand and stable as a grotto of oyster shells, in August, in London—"Please to remember the grotto, Sir; I built it all myself:—do pray remember the grotto, Sir, only a halfpenny for a candle, Sir!"

We will go to the Bible for the story about these stones; first premising, that Jordan is not what we call a river, but a brook, fordable at all times of the year, by the help of a few stones, except on the first appearance of summer, when the snows of Mount Lebanon are melted and flow down, so as to form something like a torrent. Travellers view the brook Jordan with surprise and disgust, after what they have read about it in the Bible.

The story about these twelve stones is to be found in the fourth chapter of the book of Joshua. In an irregular and contradictory manner, it is stated, that Joshua placed twelve stones in the midst of Jordan for the priests to step upon, and that they were so left to the day when the account was written. If Jordan had been an unfordable river, how could the writer have known that? Another part of the chapter says, these twelve stones were taken out of Jordan and set up at Gilgal, as a monument of crossing a brook! For it is distinctly stated, in both cases, that the twelve stones were those on which the priests had stood, so that they formed a monument in, and a monument out, of the river! Your science of correspondences, I presume, would settle this, by saying, they were spiritual stones, such as your New Jerusalem is built, or to be built, with, and that the body of the stones formed the monument in one case, and the souls in the other! When you can teach us, that one eye is the body's eye, and the other the soul's, then you will bring us to see double, like the writer of this story, Swedenborg, and you, Mr. Hindmarsh.

But further, this great and perpetual monument was built with twelve such stones as a man could pick up in a brook and carry on his shoulder! but whether of a size to weigh one, ten, or one hundred pounds, this writer does not say. Admitting that the stones were twelve hundred pounds weight in all; what a monument for future generations to talk about! It must have been just such a monument as those of which the town of my birth had several, set up by my ancestors! lifting stocks, for boys and women to get upon the back of a horse! They are common in many of the old towns of Devonshire.

There is no putting a foot in this quagmire, the Bible, without sinking into some foul story. There was something more wonderful than the building of this great monument done at Gilgal, as the sacred memorial goes. In the next chapter, we have a grand scene, a scene for an historical painter, as they have hitherto confined themselves to the Bible above

all other things. In chap. v. General Jehovah is made to order Lieutenant General Joshua, as follows:—"Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise *again* the children of Israel a *second time*!" "And Joshua made him sharp knives, and circumcised the children of Israel *at the hill of the foreskins*!" The hill of the foreskins!!! Well might Zipporah call Moses a bloody husband! If the foreskin was a nuisance, why did not Jehovah shape Adam better? But this circumcising a second time, so distinctly stated in the General's order: is like cutting off a man's head twice: for I do not understand, that a Jew's foreskin grows again. I notice the other statement; but it comes but lame after the emphasis of the General's order: "Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise *again* the children of Israel a *second time*." The strict meaning of *again, a second time*, is, that it had been twice done, and was to be twice done again! This is the grammatical sense; and the inspired writer could not err! What a job for Joshua! What a job of cutting! Four circumcisions! There could have been no need, nor fear, of resurrection men, when the people were so willing to be cut up alive!

The most striking instance on record, of the force of custom, is in the case of Abyssinian women. Some kind of circumcision, I know not what, was practised on the females as well as on the males. When the Portuguese priests got among them, they were so disgusted with the custom, that in many instances, they persuaded parents to desist, in the case of females. But what was the consequence? Not one of them could get a husband! not a man would look at them! and the uncircumcised women soon rang a peal in the ears of the Missionary Priests, that made them desist from enforcing the practice, and to consent that the uncircumcised women should be circumcised; after which, they found no difficulty to get husbands. So true is it that custom is second nature, and that all ideas of decency are made up of custom. What are all the attachments to superstitious ceremonies and observances, in comparison with this case of the Abyssinian women? With Jew, Turk, Christian, or Infidel? all positively nothing.

Here then is a clear refutation of the application of Leslie's four rules to the stories of the Old Testament.

First—There is no proof that such a man as Moses ever existed.

Second—Admitting that such a man as Moses has existed; there is no proof that he was the author of any part of the Pentateuch, or books from Genesis to Deuteronomy.

Third—There is no proof, that such a people as the Israelites were even in and emigrated from Egypt—seeing there is no reference to any thing known as a monument or custom in Egypt, to be found in any part of the Bible. There is not even a reference to the annual inundation of the Nile. There is no reference to that mythology which has been known to have been peculiar to the Egyptians, prior to the alleged residence of the Israelites among them. No historian, who lived prior to the Babylonian Captivity, has made any mention of such a people as the Jews or Israelites, living in, or going out of Egypt; nor is it known, that such a people formed a nation, before that time, to any historian whose writings have been preserved. In going from Egypt to the coasts of Syria, the Red Sea would have been left behind, or considerably at the right hand; and Pharoah, instead of running into this sea after the Israelites, might have cut off their departure in that route by a much nearer route, by taking the direct, where the Israelites had taken a retrograde and circuitous route; and he must have known too, that he might have destroyed the Israelites by famine, by keeping them on the African side of the Red Sea, or between it and the Nile, on an entirely barren ground, an acknowledged wilderness. Such a wild goose chase story will satisfy no thinking and comparing man. There is not even a reference to that noble river, the Nile, in the Bible, for that cannot be understood to be the Nile where Pharoah's daughter came down to wash: nor are bull-rushes common on its edge and banks.

Fourth—There is not a monument mentioned in the Bible, that has been known to exist since the Bible itself has been known to exist. Though any Jew might have put twelve stones together in Gilgal, if he knew where or what was Gilgal, or the Hill of Foreskins, to have made it suit the Bible story; still, there is not an atom of proof that such a collection of stones was ever seen in the vicinity of the Jordan Brook. I know well what crossing a brook upon stones means, I have crossed many, and even the river Dart by that means: a river that constitutes ten times the water of the Jordan.

Finally, to make Mr. Leslie's four rules, whereby to mark the truth of history, good, we must not admit the possibility of fable having been written. There is a wide difference between testing a story of yesterday's date, and one a thousand years old: and it cannot be shewn, that the Bible is so old by a thousand years, as the period imputed to the al-

leged passage of the Red Sea. It cannot be shewn, that such a tradition existed before the Babylonian Captivity. It is there the whole history of the Bible originates: that is to say, we cannot trace it beyond that period; nor books, nor Jews. There is a most clear and satisfactory account, how the laws of Moses, as they are called, were first introduced to the Jews, in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Up to that point, we can trace a correct history of the Jews, and no farther. For further proofs of this, I refer you to my letter to the High Priest of the Jews.

The application of these four rules to the books of the New Testament needs the same refutation.

There is no proof, that such books existed before the destruction of Jerusalem: therefore, there could be no living witnesses to prove or deny the contents of these books, as they relate to what was said or done in Jerusalem. It behoved Mr. Leslie, first to shew, that the histories of Exodus and the Gospel were compiled during the life time of the characters depicted as witnesses, and then to have laid down his rules. As the matter now stands, his rules are good for nothing, do not apply to the cases for which he has prepared them — as proofs of which, I refer you to Nos. 1 and 7 of this volume, being my letters to Dr. England and the High Priest of the Jews; where you may see, that there is no authentic history of the origin of the Jews, nor of Christianity.

In considering the validity of such tests for history, we must consider the character of the people to whom they apply. Books two thousand years ago, and books now, are, in their relations, very different things. Every printed book, now offered for sale, is supposed to be addressed to the whole people; it is supposed, that the whole of the people in the country will read, because, it is known, that it is open to be purchased if they have the means and inclination; but, we have no knowledge that such was the case with the books of the Old Testament, at any time during the period in which Jerusalem flourished as a city. It corresponds with that age, to say, that it is probable, that no second copy of the Bible, or Old Testament, existed in Jerusalem; though it is probable, that copies were made for synagogues in other places. It is known, that there was a Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch: but, though differing in some matters from the Jerusalem copy, it is not known which was the elder. Besides, it is known, that criticism is a science of which the Jews knew nothing; and whatever was written, was, to

them, inspired or sacred writing. There are people in this country, at this time, weak enough to tell me, that my capacity to write is a gift: I tell them no, that it is a trade, the art of which I am acquiring by labour and study, just as I made myself, or was made, a master of the art of working tin-plates. But the Jews had no such ideas. Every writer was to them a prophet—every writing, sacred or inspired. They no more thought of questioning the truth of what was written, than of questioning the power of their idol Jehovah to inspire the writer. The first Christians were similarly ignorant and stupid, or so many ridiculous stories, as their writings relate, could not have been listened to. I allude to apocryphal as well as canonical writings; for it is not known which were the elder. To say, therefore, that such rules as those laid down by Mr. Leslie are proper tests for the truth of any ancient piece of writing, or a security against any piece of writing being antedated, is to fly in the face of the general knowledge of history itself. By far the greater part of what is called ancient history is allegorically written; the right key to which, you of the New Jerusalem church, or the people of any other church, will never find. In many cases, these ancient stories are mere personifications of astronomical and other physical occurrences. The story of Bacchus dividing the Red Sea, is quite as good as, and more ancient than, that of Moses. And circumcision was a custom in Asia and Africa before the Jews were known as a people. You cannot shew, that the Jews were known as a people, either in Egypt or Palestine, before the Babylonian Captivity. You cannot shew that the Christian religion was known in Jerusalem, before the destruction of that city by Titus; therefore, until you can shew the contrary of my assertions, your, or Mr. Leslie's, rules, marks, or tests, do not apply. Voltaire, with all his reading, few read more, could not find any account of such a people as the Jews, before the Babylonian captivity. They must have existed somewhere, to be there as captives; but that *where* is the question.

Respecting the laws of the Jews, they have a resemblance to what was then the aggregate of custom in Asia, are evidently a compilation from different sources, and by no means, a well digested code of laws. In any digested code, written by one person, there would not occur so many repetitions. Some of those laws are moral; but there are others immoral and ridiculous enough to disgrace a God and a Prophet, much more a sensible legislator. Such are those

relating to the institution of the Priesthood ; to the Ark and Tabernacle ; to the Sacrifices ; to Blasphemy ; to cases of Jealousy in the male when there was to be none in the female ; to the Scape Goat, &c. &c. As to the question, whether or not they could be sham laws, it is admitted, that they are the production of one man ; therefore, there could be no shamming in the matter : as soon as they were observed by Jews, they became Jewish laws and not before. We have a very clear account, in the book of Ezra, of their first introduction, to that people at least.

You quote a passage from John's Gospel, in which he makes Jesus to speak in the first person ; but this proves nothing. If you have read Josephus, as one of your many thousand volumes, you have read what fine speeches he has manufactured, in the first person, for things that never were done, for characters that never existed !

The Christian memorials of baptism and supper, in the morning, sometimes before breakfast, prove nothing for Christianity. They are evidently not older than John's Gospel, which you cannot carry within the first century of the present era. If my recollection of what I have read of the early history of Christianity be good in this instance, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as a fixed observance, is a matter of comparatively modern institution : there were agapæ, or love feasts, which, in some cases were charged to resemble, or to be even more objectionable than, the Russian Physical Club ; but these were never called a sacrament, and the Methodists have revived them.

By this time, Mr. Hindmarsh, I am of opinion, that I have greatly lengthened Leslie's " short way with the Deists : " and if there were now a Duke of Leeds in existence, I should not despair of unchristianizing him, if he were honestly disposed to examine the matter. These Dukes are beginning to call themselves Christians, now knowledge of its folly is beginning to spread among the labouring classes.

I proceed to your eighteenth section.

#### A PROOF OF THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

XVIII. To the above able and conclusive reasoning of Mr. Leslie, another argument may be added in favour of the superior claims to our assent and admiration, which the Sacred Scriptures possess beyond any other writings in existence. The historical, prophetic, and evangelical books, as well as the Psalms of David, were

written by various different men, living in different ages of the world, many of whom could have no intercourse with each other; and yet these books contain a language and an idiom peculiar to divine revelation, the full purport of which was altogether unknown to the persons employed in writing them. Being dictated by Infinite Wisdom, they are all written according to one certain rule, called the science of correspondences, or the analogy subsisting between things earthly and things heavenly. So that the same expressions, wheresoever they occur, and the same natural objects, wheresoever they are mentioned, such as the sun, the moon, the stars, the clouds, the earth, the sea, mountains, vallies, trees, rivers, fountains, beasts, birds, fishes, reptiles, &c. &c., besides the ideas usually attached to those terms, uniformly bear, according to the nature of the subject treated of, another distinct signification, which is altogether different in its kind from the former, and relates not to the earthly things of this world, but to the spiritual things of another world, to heaven, the church, and the mind of man; which latter may be considered as a heaven in miniature, while his body may be justly regarded as a world in miniature. Now it is impossible, that a work, written in this manner, having two distinct senses in regular series, the one spiritual, and the other natural, particularly the former, could have been produced by any exertion of mere human skill, or by the contrivance of mere human wisdom; because the different writers had no means of concerting among themselves a language that should be so peculiarly circumstanced, as to treat of heavenly things in its interior or spiritual sense, and at the same time of earthly things in its exterior or natural sense; but being under the immediate influence of a Superior Power, they wrote down both the sentiments and the expressions, as they were dictated to them by the Divine Spirit of truth, without their being at all apprized of that extraordinary character, which distinguishes their writings from all others. And if they were thus ignorant of the rule, by which their words were first dictated, and by which they were in some succeeding age of the church to be decyphered and fully understood, it follows, that they themselves were not the *authors* of their respective works, but merely the *instruments*, *organs*, or *amanuenses*, through whom a divine revelation from the Supreme Being was communicated to mankind.

Such is the nature of the Holy Scriptures; and as the rule before alluded to, namely, the science of correspondences, is now happily discovered in the writings of that illustrious and highly illuminated Seer, Emanuel Swedenborg, the advocates for the truth of Christianity are now in possession of more ample, satisfactory, and decisive evidence in its favour, than was ever before made known to the world. Difficulties, doubts, conjectures, and suspicions, respecting the sanctity and divinity both of the Old and New Testament, are by a just view of the spiritual sense, at

once and for ever put an end to. Truth shines in all the splendour and glory of heavenly light. Love, divine love, beams and radiates in every page, in every line, in every expression: and what was before thought to contain things trivial, cruel, forbidding, and unworthy of the Divine Being to dictate, is now seen to be in all respects consistent with the allowed attributes of Deity, and a production of the most consummate wisdom, perfection, and utility.

The uniform idiom of the Bible may be easily accounted for, upon the principle that the books, though not all written by one person, were probably re-written, compiled, and translated by one person. A translator will give much of his own idiom to any author. Beyond the Bible, there is nothing said of any Hebrew Language; and though I profess not to be a linguist, my reading informs me, that the Hebrew is a corrupt mixture of the different languages that surrounded Judea, when the colony was first formed at Jerusalem by the Jewish colonists from Babylon. We know nothing of the compiler's sources; save that Job was a Persian or Chaldean book; and it is probable that so were many of the others.

With your science of correspondences, I will not meddle, as I look upon it to be a mere shuffle, to cover the immoralities, incongruities, and inconsistencies, of the different parts of the Bible. Common Sense and honest writing need no science of correspondences to pervert or to explain their meaning. I know nothing of use in language, but to describe person, thing, character, or quality; and to do this, we have no need of a science of correspondences to unite the words of the same language.

I cannot further dispute the contents of this section; I can only smile at the shuffle; so I proceed to the nineteenth.

#### THE TRUTH OF DIVINE MIRACLES.

XIX. ANOTHER charge, which Mr. Carlile brings against the Bible, is, that it is not true in *physics*; by which I suppose he means, that it abounds with cases of miraculous interposition, which being opposed to the usual course of nature, and contrary to the established laws of the universe, therefore cannot be true. But were he for a moment seriously to consider, that every thing around him is supported by miracle, exhibiting a power incessantly counteracting the properties of dead matter; that the original formation and present existence of man, even of himself, as an intelligent being, and of beasts, birds and fishes, with their several instincts, are of the same character; and that the very motion of the earth, on which he stands, so rapid and yet so regular as it is known to be, not only around its own axis, but also in its

ample orbit round the sun, as the active center of its system, is in like manner truly astonishing and miraculous; he would see good reason to hesitate, before he rashly pronounced, that this, that, or the other particular instance of supernatural agency was impossible to an omnipotent God. On the contrary, he would, as a rational and intelligent being, humbly acknowledge, that what is regarded as a miracle in one world, might, for aught he knew, be an event of common occurrence in another, where the constitution of things is different from that which prevails in our planet. But above all, if his mind were in any degree open to the perception of a spiritual power operating in and upon nature, he would cheerfully admit, that the phenomena, which he could not account for on the principles of human science, might nevertheless be perfectly consistent with some unknown laws of order, whereby those natural effects, called miracles, are produced from supernatural causes.

Besides the diurnal motion of the earth on its own axis, which is somewhat more than *a thousand miles* every hour, its annual motion in its orbit is supposed to be about *six hundred millions of miles*; consequently its daily motion is about *one million six hundred thousand miles*, its hourly motion *sixty-six thousand miles*, its motion every minute no less than *eleven hundred miles*, and its motion every instant or second of time *one hundred and eighty three miles*! Can this prodigious motion belong to matter *as matter*, when its proper state is known to be that of *rest* and *self-immobility*? Can the *vis inertia* of itself become the *vis motrix*? In other words, can that, which in itself is *dead* and *quiescent*, assume the activity of *life* and *motion*? The thing is plainly impossible. It follows, therefore, that the motion, the astonishing motion, to which the earth is subject, must have been originally communicated to it by a supernatural power, acting no doubt by the intervention of secondary causes, through the medium of the sun and its atmosphere; and also that the same Power, which first commenced, still continues to maintain and support it, with a regularity and nicety of adjustment to the motions of other planetary bodies, that nothing short of divine wisdom and divine benevolence, in perfect union, could possibly accomplish. Here then is a standing, permanent miracle, exhibited annually, monthly, weekly, daily, hourly, momentarily, before the eyes of all who are capable of beholding it! a miracle, which even an Infidel, a Materialist, and an Atheist, cannot with any face of decency or common sense refuse to acknowledge! And yet such is the obliquity, perversity, and inconsistency of some minds, that, while they are compelled to allow the *greater* miracle, they think it beneath the dignity of their understanding to assent to the *less*! (\*) Like the Scribes and Pharisees, the hypocrites and blind guides of former times, these

(\*) The terms *greater* and *less* are not here used to denote the

pretended philosophers of the present day squeamishly "strain at a gnat," and voluptuously "swallow a camel!" Matt. xxiii. 24.

In saying, that the Bible was not true in physics, I did not allude to the doctrine of miracles in particular; but rather to the cosmogony, to the deluge, to the notions it contains of the figure and character of the earth and other planets. In attempting to refute my assertion, you have given an accurate description of the motions of the earth, which would have led you to the stake two hundred years ago, as an heretic and atheist. This description pronounces the falsehood of the Jewish cosmogony, destroys all idea of such a deluge as the Bible teaches, ridicules the tale of the Sun and Moon standing still, and shews how much superior you are when you describe facts, than when you vainly attempt to cover fictions by your science of correspondences. The question is, did the compiler of the Bible know what you know about the figure and motions of the earth? The answer is no, evidently not. Did you learn any thing about the motions of the earth from the Bible? No.

I deny, that there are any things about me supported by a miracle. There are many things above my knowledge; but neither I, nor you, have any knowledge of a miracle in the common acceptation of the term; which is an opposition or contrariety to the course of nature. *Things wonderful* and *things miraculous* are not precisely the same, in the common idiom of our language; though, I know not, if your science of correspondence connects them. You say "every thing around him is supported by miracle, exhibiting a power incessantly counteracting the properties of dead matter." I know nothing of *dead matter*, as a general term. All I know about matter, is what I have before described

exertion of a greater power in giving motion to the earth, and a less power in dividing the Red Sea, and the River Jordan at a time when the water overflowed all its banks, Josh. iii. 15; or in healing the lame, the blind, the deaf, the dumb, and the sick; or in raising the dead; or in stilling the winds and the waves, by the mere utterance of a word, as the Saviour of mankind actually did while in the flesh: for in all these cases a divine power, which is Omnipotence, was alone competent to produce the effects stated. But as the miracle of the earth's motion involves every particle of matter as the subject of its operation, and occupies a greater extent of space, than the particular instances above alluded to, on this account alone the one kind of miracle is represented as being *greater* than the other.

to you, a perpetual change from fluidity to fixidity, and *vice versa*. And it is because that you do not look closely into the operations of matter, into these changes, that your head is filled with nonsense about personified spirits.

I see and admire the rapidity and regularity of the planetary motions; I judge from analogy, that the cessation of motion to any one planet would be what I will call its death; it would be thrown into chaos; therefore, the miracle does not consist in upholding them by motion, but without motion. Put a glass of water on the interior of a hoop, and put that hoop in rapid circular motion; the glass and water retain their position as if there was no motion; and this principle of individual rest, in relation to general motion, is precisely our state upon the surface of the earth. If your Jehovah can stop the motion of any one of the planets, then he is an object worthy of our admiration from his superior power; but if there be no Jehovah to do this—**THERE IS NO GOD—no intelligent power superior to man.** Motion is natural; any thing miraculous or supernatural must be a cessation of motion. It is, because *I do fully consider these things*, that I differ from you, who do not fully consider them; and ever bear in mind the most certain of all axioms, **THAT ALL DIFFERENCE OF OPINION AMONG MANKIND IS NOTHING MORE THAN A DIFFERENCE IN THEIR KNOWLEDGE.** If they would but instruct and be instructed, instead of wrangling and fighting, instead of seeking to do each other the greatest possible amount of injury, because of a difference in opinion, in knowledge more and less, they would soon begin to look back upon past ages or races of mankind, as brutes reduced to the lowest scale, by the brutalizing powers of religion. We want a moral people without religion; as it is impossible to make a people at the same time, religious and moral.

If, in your many thousand read-volumes, you had read some of the right sort, you would have silently assented to my assertion, that the Bible is not true in physics. This has been the master-objection with all persons who have been bold enough to touch the subject—a hundred writers have explained it; and I would proceed to the repetition, if I had not a suitable article from a correspondent waiting to be appended to this letter.

After having described some of the motions of the earth, you ask: "Can this prodigious motion belong to matter *as matter*, when its proper state is known to be that of rest and self-immobility? Can the *vis inertiae* of itself become the

*vis motrix*? In other words, can that, which in itself is dead and quiescent, assume the activity of *life* and *motion*?" The error, the impossibility, lies in your question. *Vis inertiae*; *dead and quiescent matter*; are nonsense, the terms are not applicable to any general state of matter. The former is a contradiction in itself, the latter physically untrue. Fixed matter is not dead matter, beyond its change from some former quality: it is only dead to its former identity, and waiting that dispersion to which all identity sooner or later must submit. Read again, look again, and see, that all is change from fluidity to fixidity and from fixidity to fluidity. Life is nothing more than a peculiar passage of fluid through an organized series of tubes of fixed matter; and it is the property of the fluid to form and fix the tubes from some unknown germs, to renew them again and again, and finally to wear them out and disperse them: thus, making matter, in the abstract, the creator and destroyer of all its identities; a playful, careless, and undesigning power; and, as such, always exhibiting similar effects from similar combinations; necessitated though not directed—necessitated in quality; but not in ulterior design. When I speak of things wonderful, I consider, or define rather, that I am only speaking of my ignorance of those things: if you can bring yourself to the same confession, we shall not long disagree.

(*To be continued.*)

---

*Subscriptions received at 84, Fleet Street.*

|   |    |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| J. E. C., a real and practical Republican   | £2 | 0 | 0 | W. J., for January and February, to Mr. Carlile | 4 | 0 |
| Mr. Thomas Middleton, Republican and Deist, Crayford, Kent, being his fifth subscription, per J. Townsend |    |   |   | Ditto, to Mrs. Wright                           | 2 | 0 |
|   |    |   |   | Ditto, to William Tunbridge                     | 2 | 0 |
| D. King   | 2  | 6 |   | W. W., to Mr. Carlile                           | 2 | 6 |
| E. R.   | 2  | 6 |   | Ditto, to Mrs. Wright                           | 2 | 6 |
| Innocent  | 2  | 0 |   | Mr. Warburton, to Mrs. Wright                   | 2 | 6 |
| W. H. S.  | 2  | 6 |   | Mr. Wroe, to Joseph Rhodes and William Holmes   | 5 | 0 |

William Tunbridge acknowledges the receipt of £2. from the Reformers of Nottingham, through Mr. Colclough and Mr. Doubleday.

---

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 84, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.